

Ho and Hosotani reply: Hagen and Sudarshan (HS) claim that (6) of Ref. [1] is incorrect and that their new solution (2) of Ref. [2] implies the non-dynamical nature of non-integrable phases θ_j 's. We show that the argument in Ref. [1] is correct and consistent, and that HS's solution has inconsistency leading to non-vanishing commutators of $[P^1, P^2]$ and $[P^j, H]$ even in physical states. This proves that many of HS's statements in Ref. [2] are based merely on incorrect guess, but not on careful algebra.

In Ref. [1] Chern-Simons theory is formulated by first eliminating unphysical degrees of freedom. Dynamical variables are $\psi(x)$ and θ_j 's. There are four ingredients; (i) Hamiltonian given by (5) and (6), (ii) equal time commutation relations among ψ , $\psi^\dagger$, and θ_j 's, (iii) physical state condition (9), and (iv) boundary conditions (BC) on a torus, (3).

The theory thus formulated is equivalent to the original theory described by (1) - (3). Our solution (6) contains the field equation $(\kappa/4\pi)\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho}f_{\nu\rho} = j^\mu$ except for three relations. Two of them are equations for θ_j 's, which in this formulation follows from $i\theta_j = [\theta_j, H]$. The third one is the relation between Q and Φ , which does not follow from (i) and (ii), but is imposed as a physical state condition. The last point has not been fully appreciated in the earlier paper (Ref. [3]).

Although HS state that there are "errors" in Ref. [1], there is no error and the argument in Ref. [1] is perfectly consistent. What HS do is to propose their "new solution" with different BC, whose validity and consistency we shall now turn on to check.

HS's solution (2) of Ref. [2] is explicitly

$$\begin{aligned} a_0(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{x_k}{L_k} \left\{ \dot{\theta}_k + \alpha \epsilon^{kl} \frac{2\pi}{\kappa L_l} J^l \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int d\mathbf{y} \epsilon^{kl} \nabla_k^x D(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot j^l(y) \\ a_k(x) &= \frac{\theta_k}{L_k} + \frac{\epsilon^{kl} x_l}{2L_1 L_2} \cdot \frac{2\pi Q}{\kappa} \\ &\quad + \frac{2\pi}{\kappa} \int d\mathbf{y} \epsilon^{kl} \nabla_l^x D(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \cdot j^0(y) \end{aligned} \quad (A1)$$

where $J^k = \int d\mathbf{x} j^k(x)$. We have introduced a parameter α in the expression for a_0 . HS's solution gives $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$. Insertion of (A1) to f_{0k} yields $(\kappa/2\pi)\epsilon^{kl}f_{0l}(x) = j^k(x) + (\alpha - 1)J^k/L_1 L_2$ so that the equations are not satisfied unless $\alpha = 1$. Note that $\Delta D(\mathbf{x}) = \delta(\mathbf{x}) - (L_1 L_2)^{-1}$.

The comparison of (A1) with (6) of Ref. [1] shows two differences. (a) (A1) has an additional term $\sum (x_k/L_k)\{\dots\}$ in the expression for a_0 , which vanishes on shell for $\alpha = 1$. (b) In the second term in the expression for a_k , (A1) has an operator $2\pi Q/\kappa$, whereas ours has a c-number $-\Phi$. (Note that $\int d\mathbf{y} \nabla_l D(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = 0$.)

HS's solution satisfies different BC. In the notation (3) of Ref. [1], $\beta_j = \beta_j^{\text{HS}} = \epsilon^{jk} x_k \pi Q / L_k \kappa$ for $\alpha = 1$ on shell. For $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, β_j^{HS} contains an additional term. In either case β_j^{HS} is an operator satisfying $[\beta_j^{\text{HS}}, \psi] \neq 0$. This BC must be respected in order that physical gauge invariant operators be single-valued on a torus.

The most serious problem in HS's solution arises in commutators of P^j and H . We have evaluated the commutators by adopting (5) of Ref. [1] with HS's solution for $a_k(x)$ in (A1) substituted. HS also claim that θ_j 's are not dynamical. So we have evaluated the commutators in two ways, one by taking $[\theta_1, \theta_2] = 2\pi i/\kappa$ as in Ref. [1], and the other by taking $[\theta_1, \theta_2] = 0$.

The evaluation is straightforward, but requires extra care on the ordering of operators. The result is

$$\begin{aligned} [P^j, P^k] &= \epsilon^{jk} \frac{2\pi i}{\kappa L_1 L_2} (Q \text{ or } Q(1 - Q)) \\ [P^j, H] &= \epsilon^{jk} \frac{2\pi i}{\kappa L_1 L_2} (J^k \text{ or } J^k(1 - Q)) \end{aligned} \quad (A2)$$

This contradicts with HS's statement that all commutators vanish. (A2) causes a serious problem. P^j 's and H do not commute with each other even in physical states except for $Q = 0 = J^k$, or $Q = 1$.

The correct commutators (11) and dynamical nature of θ_j 's are important in establishing the connection to anyon quantum mechanics [1]. With (A2) such connection cannot be achieved.

To summarize, the argument in Ref. [1] is correct, whereas HS's solution leads to inconsistency.

This research was supported in part by Republic of China Grant No. NSC 83-0208-M032-017 (C.-L.H.) and by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-83ER-40105 (Y.H.).

Choon-Lin Ho

Department of Physics
Tamkang University
Tamsui, Taiwan 25137
Republic of China

Yutaka Hosotani

School of Physics and Astronomy
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Received ??? March 1994

PACS numbers: ???

- [1] C.-L. Ho and Y. Hosotani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1360 (1993).
- [2] C.R. Hagen and E.C.G. Sudarshan, Comment on "Operator Algebra ..." LCK524.
- [3] Y. Hosotani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2785 (1989); *ibid.* **64**, 1691 (1990).